

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated May 21, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

All pending claims were rejected under 35 USC 102, on the basis of the newly-cited Bezos et al patent (US 6,029,141). It is respectfully submitted that the Bezos patent is directed to a different type of electronic commerce site than that represented in the currently pending claims. More particularly, the Bezos patent discloses an associate program, that enables an associate to refer a customer, who visits the associate's web site, on to a merchant for a sale. In that situation, the associate's web site displays information about products available through the merchant. A customer first visits the associate's web site, and obtains information about a product. In the examples given in the patent, the customer can read a review about a book. If the customer is interested in the product, he or she is referred to the merchant's web site to enable the customer to purchase that product. When the customer purchases a product as a result of that referral, the associate is given a commission or some other form of compensation.

In contrast, the claims are directed to a customized store that can be set up at the vendor's web site itself. In this type of situation, an administrator designates a selected set of products of the vendor, and/or specialized pricing for the vendor's products, that are to appear in the customized store. For example, a school administrator might set up a limited number of computers that are specifically configured to comply with various curricula at the school. Thereafter, when a customer accesses the vendor's site, that customer is presented with the customized store that displays the set of products and/or prices designated by the administrator.

In the Bezos patent, the customer accesses the site of the associate, and is then referred on to the merchant's site to complete the sale of a product the customer viewed at the associate's site. In contrast, in the context of the claimed invention, the customer accesses the merchant's site, and upon doing so is presented with a customized view of products available at that site. It is respectfully submitted that, due to the disparate objective and arrangement of the system disclosed in the Bezos patent, it does not anticipate the subject matter of the pending claims.

Claim 94 recites a system for presenting customized information at an electronic commerce site. This system includes a database storing information relating to products offered by a vendor at an electronic commerce site, and an administrative application that provides an administrator with an interface to view the information relating to those products and to store *in said database* configuration data that defines a custom store having at least one of a restricted set of products and non-standard pricing for products.

In rejecting the previously pending claims, the Office Action refers to the database 136 disclosed in the Bezos patent, which is located at the merchant's web site. In contrast to the claimed subject matter, however, the Bezos patent does not disclose that configuration data defining a custom store is stored in that database. Rather, the database 136 simply stores the web pages that display the products of the merchant. There is no disclosure of an administrative program that can be used to customize the display of those products. Likewise, the associate database 160 at the merchant's site only contains information about the associates who have enrolled

with the merchant. It does not contain configuration data that defines a custom store.

Claim 94 goes on to recite a custom store application that examines a referrer header field in a request from a customer for access to the electronic commerce site, to determine whether the referrer field indicates that the *customer request* originated from a predetermined host. If the referrer field indicates that the request originated from the predetermined host, the custom store application generates and causes to be displayed a custom store page from said vendor's electronic commerce site that contains the restricted set of products and/or the non-standard pricing for products, as defined by configuration data associated with the predetermined host. The Bezos patent does not disclose that a custom store is displayed from the *vendor's* site, nor that such a store is displayed in dependence upon the origin of a *customer's* request. Rather, it discloses that, upon a referral from an associate, i.e. an intermediate party, the merchant site displays to the customer a particular product that was identified in the referral. In other words, the product that is displayed to the customer is based upon information provided by the referring associate, as determined by a selection made by the customer at that associate's site, and not on the basis of configuration data stored in a database.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure that the *origin* of the customer's request plays any role in the products and/or pricing that is displayed to the customer. Rather, it is only based upon the referral from the associate.

For at least these reasons, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claim 94 is not anticipated by the Bezos patent. For at least these

same reasons, claim 103 is not anticipated. Consequently, dependent claims 95-98 and 104-107 are not anticipated.

Claims 99-102 and 108-111 are directed to another facet of the invention, namely a reconciliation feature that determines whether the configuration data includes information relating to products that are no longer available from the vendor, and provides notification to the administrator if such information is included in the configuration data. In connection with this feature, the Office Action referred to the Bezos patent at column 18, lines 45-50. This portion of the patent pertains to reports that are provided from the merchant to the associates. Among other items, the reports can indicate items that are no longer carried in the merchant's catalog.

It is respectfully submitted that this disclosure is not sufficient to anticipate the subject matter of the claims. The reconciliation feature is recited in the claims within the context of defining a custom store by means of configuration data stored in a database. If the configuration data includes references to obsolete products, the administrator who is storing the configuration data is provided with a notice to that effect. As discussed previously in connection with claim 94, the Bezos patent does not disclose that configuration data defining a custom store is stored in a database. As such, it cannot be interpreted to disclose the additional concept of reconciling such configuration data against obsolete products.

For at least these reasons, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: October 22, 2007

By: /james labarre/  
James LaBarre  
Registration No. 28,632

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620